

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,132	07/11/2003		Ming Che Wu	62188.011200	4425
45599	7590	12/22/2004		EXAMINER	
		URIG LLP	MAI, HUY KIM		
MET LIFE I		G	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YOR	K, NY 10	0166	2873		

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/618,132	WU, MING CHE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Huy K. Mai	2873
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 06 December 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a chiplaces the application in
PERIOD FOR REI	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing da	•	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS F706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	IN SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE e on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	s Brief must be filed within the p R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	period set forth in of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	•
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•	,
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE: The proposed amendment would require	a different combination in the rejec	etion.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment (explanation of how the new or amended claims wo		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-8,11</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen		•
10. Other:	:	
	Hu	ul Mai

Huy Mai Primary Examiner Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It is not agreed with the applicant's opinion "It appears that due to there being raised rib...". The applicant does not show the patentaly distinct features and point out the reasons why his upper and lower clamping plates generating substantially no bending force, but the Chao's does.